REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6 and 9-14 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated in the remarks set forth below, the claim amendments are made for the purpose of correcting informalities and/or to more clearly define the claimed invention, and are not made for the purpose of overcoming the cited art.

The Patent Office rejects claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 11 and 13 have been amended to change the phrase "computer usable medium" to --computer readable storage medium--, as suggested by the Patent Office. Claim 12 depends from claim 11, and claim 14 depends from claim 13. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-14 are directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Amdt. dated February 28, 2007

Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2006

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,600 to Salas et al. (hereinafter "Salas"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Salas fails to disclose every claimed feature, as required under §102. Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "sending application code for creating reports to the client over the distributed network, in response to a first report request from the client." Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, "receiving application code for creating reports from a server over the distributed network, in response to a first report request sent from the client side." Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "computer readable program code for receiving, from a server over a distributed network, computer readable application code for creating reports, in response to a first report request sent from the client side." Independent claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, "computer readable program code for sending the computer readable application code for creating reports to the client over the distributed network, in response to a first report request from the client."

Salas fails to teach or suggest these features. The Patent Office alleges that Salas discloses, in Column 2, lines 39-45, sending code for creating reports to the client over the distributed network, in response to a first report request from the client. Applicants

Serial No. 10/799,738 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2006

respectfully disagree. Column 2, lines 39-45 of Salas merely states that a "A file request is received from a client workstation" and that "[a]n application capable of viewing the file is invoked" (emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion of application code being sent from the server to the client in response to the first time a report is requested, as recited in claims 1, 6, 11 and 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that networked collaborative work environment disclosed in Salas utilizes "page builder" applications that already reside on the client workstations to generate, display and manage the "eRooms" (see column 6, lines 57-63). In contrast, the present invention delivers the code necessary to generate a report to the client when the client first requests the report. This allows, for example, any web browser (client) to request a report from a web site hosted on a web server and have the code for generating that report sent to the web browser by the web server so that the report can be generated locally on the client web browser. If the user then visits a different web site and requests a report from that web site, a different application code may be sent to the client web browser by that web site for generating the reports unique to that web site.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Salas fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 1, 6, 11 and 13. Claims 2-5 depend

Serial No. 10/799,738 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2006

from claim 1, claims 7-10 depend from claim 6, claim 12 depends from claim 11, and claim 14 depends from claim 13.. Thus, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, René A. Vazquez, at the telephone number listed below.

Docket No. QSI-0001C2

Serial No. 10/799,738 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2006

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

THE FLESHNER GROUP, PLLC

Kené A. Vazquez, Esq. Registration No. 38,647

P.O. Box 220898 Chantilly, Virginia 20153-0898 703 766-3701

Date: February 28, 2007
Q:\Documents\2006-025\Document in ProLaw

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 68733